



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

MeS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/988,246	12/01/97	RADUX	AM1771-4-T19

IM62/0809

WILLIAM L SHAFFER  
PATENT COUNSEL MS/2061  
LEGAL AFFAIRS DEPT. P O BOX 450A  
APPLIED MATERIALS INC  
SANTA CLARA CA 95052

EXAMINER

ZERVIGON, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1763

17

DATE MAILED: 08/09/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
-08/988,246

Applicant(s)

Sebastien et al

Examiner

Rudy Zervigon

Group Art Unit  
1763



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rudy Zervigon

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Chun-Pok Leung

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Aug 2, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 11

Identification of prior art discussed:

Patrick et al (U.S. Pat. 5,474,648).

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Chun-Pok Leung's sole argument is concerning a multiplicity of claim 11's second impedance monitor. As discussed in the final action, there is clearly stated evidence that Patrick et al provide impedance measures between two electrodes: The Patrick et al sensor may measure the chamber impedance as desired. A second impedance monitor would be considered obvious under the following case law:

Harza, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960)

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

GREGORY MILLS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

RUDY ZERVIGON  
PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1763